

September 28, 2005

To whom it may concern:

We wished to reply to the scoring of our proposal with several questions and comments. We hope these will help us understand where we failed to communicate our plans and also to understand where we felt we did communicate but were told we failed to address the issues.

Work plan:

We did consider our plan to be a conservation plan as well as benefiting other needs. Our goal, "no net water loss" we believed was a conservation plan, not strictly a recycling plan, in that this project would decrease the amount of water we needed to import from Northern California.

The evaluation states: "more detail in needed". What should we have included if this was a planning grant not an implementation funding project? We considered that funding would help with planning. Our agency has not had the additional funds to have actual studies done and hoped this project would help with these costs.

Also, how do we address cost estimates with documentation without having funding to do that? We had our engineers' study our proposed plan and they provided us with the figures.

Description of Region:

The evaluation comment stated; "the region is somewhat defined". We felt our narrative; the first six pages were dedicated to describing the region. How else could we have described this in more detail? We agree the maps are small and contacted your office describing the difficulties we were having with the maps.

The maps however did show the current wells, infrastructure and also where the proposed project elements would be located. The narrative also described in detail the existing infrastructure in detail for each area as well as how each area relates to the whole area.

The evaluation states that we failed to show or describe existing major water related infrastructure or the locations of all the proposed implementation projects. We are *completely* confused by this as we did discuss the current infrastructure on pages 6,7,8 and 9 and discussed our proposed project locations in detail. What else could we have described?

Disadvantaged Communities:

Following the guidelines for this grant, we did not include this information as we were not applying for the disadvantaged funding. After locating information from the Census bureau, we noted that our median income was much, much higher and that we were not applying for that and did not need to address this issue at all. We felt we were following the guidelines by doing this.

These were the major concerns that we were very confused about and hoped to have these addressed to help us in the future. We felt that our plan was not just a recycling plan at all, but were conserving water by the reuse of it. Our agencies are very, very small and coordination is not always very strict, as many informal meetings occur and decisions are made. We felt our district is unique and very in need of a plan to assist with water conservation as and had hoped that we conveyed our need in an reasonable matter.

We would welcome comments especially to the above issues and any other so that we may be competitive in future endeavors.

Thank you for your time,

RSWD.